

SEC. 3. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider the resolution (H. Res. 479) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for enforcement of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) the amendment printed in section 4, if offered by Representative Boehner of Ohio or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for forty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

Strike all after "That" and insert the following:

(1) Clause 9(a) of rule XXI is amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (3), striking the period at the end of subparagraph (4) and inserting "; or", and adding the following at the end:

"(5) A Senate bill held at the desk, an amendment between the Houses, or an amendment considered as adopted pursuant to an order of the House, unless the Majority Leader or his designee has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill and amendments (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted the request for each respective item in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration."

(2) Clause 9(c) of rule XXI is amended to read as follows:

"(c) As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (a), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiation the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn."

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

"the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from *Congressional Quarterly's* "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1528.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

#### NEW ENGLAND NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL DESIGNATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 940 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1528.

□ 1649

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1528) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the New England National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes, with Mr. LYNCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1528 amends the National Trails System Act to designate most of an existing trail system in Massachusetts and Connecticut as the New England National Scenic Trail. In 2002, Congress directed the National Park Service to study this trail for potential addition to the National Trails System. The draft study, completed in 2006, supports designation of the trail, with some changes to the route to address landowner concerns. The administration has testified that no major changes in the study are expected, and expressed support for the measure in testimony before the Natural Resources Committee.

The trail runs 220 miles through the heart of Connecticut and Massachusetts, past some of the most spectacular vistas and landscapes in New England. The trail offers some of the world's best opportunities to view volcanic and glacial geology, including fossil and dinosaur footprints. The proposed trail also fulfills another requirement of the National Trails System Act by being close to population centers. This trail has over 2 million people that live within 10 miles of the route, and this accessibility makes the trail a wonderful recreational opportunity.

The route of the trail crosses land owned by State and local governments and by private landowners. No Federal land is involved. Local trails associations have obtained permission from landowners allowing existing trails to cross their lands. If a landowner requests that the association close the trail on his or her property, the association honors that request. The NPS study identified no need for direct Federal trail ownership or direct Federal trail management.

If H.R. 1528 is enacted, the role of the National Park Service in implementing the designation would be to provide technical and financial assistance to